DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 155 801 EA 010 661

AUTHOR Farquhar, Robin H.
TITLE Nonpublic School Effects on Public Schools: Perceptions of Public School Administrators.
PUB DATE [Apr 69]
NOTE 50p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel; *Administrator Attitudes; *Catholic Schools; *Conflict; *Cooperation; Dual Enrollment; Elementary Secondary Education; Hypothesis Testing; National Surveys; Nonpublic School Aid; Parochial School Aid; Parochial Schools; *Private Schools; *Public Schools; Shared Services; Statistical Analysis; Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

The study described in this report investigated the perceptions held by public school administrators concerning the effects of private schools on the operation of public schools. Questionnaires were completed and returned by several randomly selected principals and the superintendent of public schools in each of 41 American cities with populations between 100,000 and 200,000. Respondents indicated the strength with which they perceived 23 postulated effects to operate in their cities with reference, first, to systemic private schools (members of national, religiously supported systems) and, secondly, to independent private schools (not identified with any formal system). In general, respondents perceived the effects of private schools on public schools to be negligible in impact. Responses were analyzed statistically to determine the nature of perceived private school effects on public schools (both in general and in terms of the systemic-independent distinction), and to examine some characteristics of variance among these perceptions. Interviews were then conducted with a sample of participants in seven cities. The major result of the interviews was the finding that participants in general lacked concern for, interest in, and familiarity with private schools or their effects on public schools. (Author/MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robin H. Farquhar

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

ED155801

NONPUBLIC SCHOOL EFFECTS ON PUBLIC SCHOOLS: PERCEPTIONS OF PUBLIC SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

By

Robin H. Farquhar
Dean of Education

University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Canada

A stormy tradition characterizes the history of relationships between public and nonpublic school supporters in the United States. Until well into the nineteenth century, virtually all formal education in this country was conducted in a variety of nonpublic establishments. The concept of public education did not achieve a significant level of acceptance until about 1850. This acceptance was hard-won and its achievement was preceded by a quarter-century of heightened conflict during which nonpublic educators sought to protect their "vested rights." In Cubberley's words, "excepting the battle for the abolition of slavery, perhaps no question has ever been before the American people for settlement which caused so much feeling or aroused such a bitter antagonisms."[1] Later during the same century, a nationwide system of parochial schools was established by the Catholic Church, largely in protest to the apparent protestantism of public education. Reaction to those schools was almost as heated as to the earlier emergence of the public agencies, as evidenced by several attempts during the early twentieth century to legislate private education out of existence.[2] Nevertheless, nonpublic schools, both religious and non-sectarian, have survived and multiplied during the present century.

The level of conflict diminished somewhat during the middle decades of this century, finding its expression largely in a continuing debate on the relative merits of public and nonpublic schooling.[3] However, a rapid growth in nonpublic school enrollments during the post-World War II years

EA 010 661

and a recent "sky-rocketing" of educational costs have resulted in renewed demands from most of the nonpublic sector for public financial assistance to support its schools. Limited responses by the federal government to these demands have met with such opposition that the erstwhile public-nonpublic controversy has been revived with much of its original fervor.[4] Yet, most currently discernible signs point to probable increases in governmental support for nonpublic education, at both the federal and state levels, and one may thus anticipate a continuation of conflict between proponents of public and nonpublic schools for several years to come.

Viewed from the perspective of the present, the tradition of stormy relationships between public and nonpublic school supporters may be unfortunate. Increasingly, America is looking to education as the primary avenue of escape from the blight which is threatening the total destruction of its urban centers. But by and large the public schools are falling short in this regard, in part because the expectations held for them are unrealistically high and in part because the resources available to them are sadly deficient. In 1962 it was reported that one-third of all nonpublic school students in the country lived in its 50 largest cities[5]; moreover, 56 of the nation's 212 Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas have at least one-fifth of their elementary pupils enrolled in nonpublic schools.[6] In the light of these data, one suspects that communication and cooperation between public and nonpublic schools might have potential for contributing significantly to the resolution of the major domestic problem in today's America. Support for the development of functional working relationships between public and nonpublic schools need not be justified on the basis of population distribution alone. Functionally, the two sectors of education pursue essentially similar goals; but they differ structurally and it is in this difference that much potential for mutual assistance lies. For example, many nonpublic

schools have only recently begun to view the education of the underprivileged as an important contribution to their larger mission; in undertaking this task they have much to learn from public education which, by definition, has had to provide this service since its inception. On the other hand, public schools suffer from bureaucratic inertia and structural inflexibility which render them less capable of experimentation and rapid response to changing needs than their comparatively unconstrained nonpublic counterparts; the former could learn much from simply observing the latter. Several more specific examples could be cited to demonstrate the desirability of functional working relationships between the public and nonpublic sectors of American education.

It is apparent, however, that communication and cooperation between public and nonpublic educators have been uncommon. Among the few examples of collaboration which exist, shared time is the most typical form. But it is not in wide practice nationally, and considerable dissatisfaction with it has been voiced.[7] The "major breakthrough" in the church-state barrier supposedly represented by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has not, according to the study by Nuccio and Walsh of nonpublic school pupils' participation in Title I programs during 1966, led to any nationally significant improvement in collaboration between the two sectors at either the state or the local level. These researchers found, moreover, that many nonpublic school students were not receiving the benefits to which they were entitled under Title I, in large part because of a lack of communication and cooperation between officials of public and nonpublic schools.[8] With specific reference to local collaboration in metropolitan areas, Erickson and Greeley present the following analysis:

> In many urban centers, public and non-public schools that might profitably share their services and facilities continue to operate

> in insular detachment. In other cases, efforts to arrange concerted action run afoul of so much prejudice and bureaucratic inertia that pedestrain outcomes are viewed as a triumph of diplomacy. To be sure, the idea of sharing is not universally or painlessly applicable. Some schools are too far apart to permit frequent shuffling of personnel. Complex calendars and schedules are difficult to mesh. Questions of jurisdiction and responsibility arise concerning discipline, extra-curricular activities, pupil injuries, grading, promotion, and graduation. Often public schools are ineligible for state aid for students primarily enrolled in non-public schools. The sharing concept is hard to reconcile with the contention of many religious leaders that no subjects are truly "secular," "neutral," or "value-free," since all of knowledge must relate to theistic premises. But it seems the only explanation for some barriers to cooperation is a deeply ingrained resistance to mutuality between public and non-public schools.[9]

In light of the potential fruitfulness of collaboration discussed previously, this presents a discouraging picture.

Several kinds of obstacles which tend to inhibit functional communication and cooperation between public and nonpublic schools may be postulated. Probably the most frequently cited are in the nature of legal and constitutional barriers. In the Nuccio and Walsh report, legal problems associated with the implementation of ESEA Title I were cited as "formidable, complex, and emotionally charged."[10] However, perhaps even more significant are the problems which arise through the misinterpretation of legal barriers as, for example, when public officials deny legitimate requests from nonpublic schools, or when nonpublic school officials make requests which are clearly beyond the intention and purview of existing legislation. Many of these legal barriers are, of course, reflections of perceived constitutional barriers, some of which are real while others are manufactured representations of emotionally-based opposition. A third important barrier to functional working relationships between public and nonpublic schools is structural in nature. Geographic boundaries for public and nonpublic school systems in the same general area frequently do not coincide, and the administrative structures and roles in the two sectors are seldom

comparable. In addition, differences in such technical realms as scheduling, evaluating, and reporting often inhibit collaboration between the two systems of education.

Although the above barriers have some basis in fact, they are augmented by misunderstanding and emotion. Several other barriers are more thoroughly emotional in character. One such obstacle is the financial barrier. While some ardent public school proponents believe that nonpublic schools should receive no monetary assistance from the public coffers because their existence serves no worthwhile purpose (and may, they say, be detrimental to the health of the country's social order and public school systems), many nonpublic school proponents believe that they deserve some public assistance because they are performing a public service, are maintaining the diversity which is essential to a democratic society, and are relieving the public schools of the cost of educating a substantial number of children. Because the need and the demand for public aid on the part of nonpublic schools are strong, bad feelings tend to result from such a drastic opposition of views. A second largely emotional barrier grows from philosophical roots in that the educational, religious, societal, and even moral values embodied in some kinds of nonpublic education tend to be rather diametrically opposed to those espoused by the public schools. The result again is frequently bad feeling between the two sectors. Third, there is the protest-riven historical barrier discussed at the beginning of this chapter. Finally, one may discern a complex of psychologically oriented obstacles. These include the distrust, jealousy, and downright fear which those in the two educational systems sometimes feel for each other. Such emotions are in part an outgrowth of the naturally competitive framework within which the two systems are placed, and in part a result of the existence of some of the other barriers alluded to above.

Most of the obstacles to effective public-nonpublic school collaboration that have been identified are of a rather personal nature; they tend to be expressions of the protectiveness or defensiveness one feels as a result of his individual and institutional identification and commitment. That is, these barriers appear to be erected, at least in part, upon a perceptual foundation consisting largely of one's views about the ways in which the effective operation of the schools with which he identifies (which represent, in effect, his professional raison d'etre) is affected by the existence of schools in the opposite sector. It seems likely that, if one views the success of his educational enterprise to be threatened or reduced by the functioning of schools in the opposite sector, emotional barriers to communication and cooperation between public and nonpublic schools will significantly determine his behavior vis-a-vis the pursuit of functional working relationships between the two educational sectors. Conversely, it can be expected that, if one views the effective operation of his schools to be enhanced by the existence of schools in the opposite sector, his emotional bent will be toward rather than against the achievement of inter-sector communication and cooperation. Finally, if one views the impact of the opposite sector on the functioning of his schools to be negligible (i.e., neither significantly destructive nor significantly supportive), it can be anticipated that he will not have a substantial emotional predisposition either in favor of or opposed to inter-sector collaboration, at least insofar as this emotional predisposition is related to his institutional identification. In this last case, one would probably need to look beyond perceived inter-sector effects to determine the causes of barriers to functional working relationships between public and nonpublic schools.

The study reported in this chapter sought, in part, to determine which of the above three conditions tends to predominate. Attention was

limited to the examination of influence in one direction only, in that the study explored the perceptions of public school administrators in regard to the effects on their schools of nonpublic schools. Administrators were selected as the reference group in the belief that, if perceived inter-sector effects influence the nature and degree of collaboration, this influence will be determined more by the perceptions of school administrators than by those of any other group of individuals. This research was conducted during the 1965-66 academic year and was supported in large part by a grant from Phi Delta Kappa to the Midwest Administration Center at The University of Chicago. The following sections of this chapter report the design and methodology of the study, its major findings, and some conclusions and speculations deriving from these results.

Design and Methodology

For the purposes of this study, nonpublic schools were defined as all schools in the United States which provide a full, day-time program of elementary and/or secondary education to those students who are not enrolled in the public schools. According to the most reliable information available at this time, this definition included more than 18,000 schools, enrolling approximately six million children (about 14 per cent of the country's total elementary and secondary enrollment). Because of the wide variety of schools covered by this definition they were classified into two major, structurally oriented categories for analytical purposes: systemic schools (those which are members of a national, religiously supported system of schools) and independent schools (those which operate independently of any formal educational system). At the time of the study about 93 per cent of all nonpublic pupils were enrolled in systemic schools and, within this

category, approximately 95 per cent of the students were attending Catholic schools. The definitional distinction between systemic and independent schools constitutes an integral aspect of the design and methodology employed in the research. Reviewed in this section are the conceptual framework upon which the study was based and the approaches utilized in collecting and analyzing the data.

Conceptual Framework

Because of the almost total lack of research into nonpublic school effects on public schools, it was not possible to solicit the perceptions of public school administrators in relation to actual, known effects. On the other hand, it was not necessary to solicit their perceptions in a totally unstructured fashion; nor, in the interests of validity and comprehensiveness, was this deemed desirable. As is usual in such situations, an approach between these two extremes was adopted: the perceptions of public schools administrators were solicited with reference to postulated effects of nonpublic schools on public schools--effects which, while seldom empirically justified, are supported varying degrees by limited evidence, published opinion, or inductive logic. These postulated effects and some hypotheses related to them are identified below.

Postulated Effects. A rather thorough review of the literature relevant to public-nonpublic school relationships, supplemented by discussions with scholars and administrators knowledgeable in this problem area and by responses on a pre-test of the study's instrumentation resulted in the postulation of 21 effects of nonpublic schools on public schools. Each of these effects was defined operationally and given a descriptive name. The postulated effects, listed alphabetically according to name, are pre-

sented below with their descriptions (one of the main sources in the literature from which each was inferred is cited in a footnote for illustrative purposes):

Associative Effect - By keeping white patrons of nonpublic schools in the city, nonpublic schools help to stabilize communities that are in danger of becoming all-Negro, and thereby help the public schools.[11]

Color-Separation Effect - Attempts to integrate the public schools are hindered by the fact that so many white students are in nonpublic schools.[12]

Competitive Effect - Some of the experimentation and innovation which take place in the public schools is the result of a felt need to "keep up with, or ahead of" nonpublic schools.[13]

Coopting Effect - Nonpublic schools utilize teachers, administrators, and lay leaders who could be of value to the public schools, and the potential effectiveness of the public schools is thereby diminished.[14]

Depressant Effect (Federal) - Because nonpublic school proponents have been instrumental in defeating certain Congressional bills for general federal aid to public schools, the public schools have suffered financially.[15]

Depressant Effect (State) - Proponents of nonpublic schools tend to oppose increases in state aid for public schools, with the result that the public schools suffer financially.[16]

Divisive Effect - On educational issues, proponents of nonpublic schools tend to oppose the public school position, with undesirable consequences for the public schools.[17]

Dumping Effect - Nonpublic schools enroll a disproportionate share of the city's bright students, leaving most slow learners to the public schools. (This effect was postulated twice - once with reference to the elementary level and once to the secondary.)[18]

Duplication Effect - The breadth and depth of public school curricular and extracurricular offerings are restricted because many students are enrolled in nonpublic schools.[19]

Escape Effect - Racial integration in the public schools is inhibited because some white parents transfer their children to nonpublic schools to escape integration.[20]

Escape-Valve Effect - Because certain extremist groups in the city are able to indulge their interests through nonpublic schools, the public schools are relieved of some potential problems.[21]

False-Yardstick Effect - Because many nonpublic schools operate with relatively large classes and small per-pupil expenditures, citizens tend to resist efforts to reduce class size and increase expenditures in the public schools.[22]

Foil Effect - Moral support for the public schools is enhanced because nonpublic schools are so obviously substandard that they make people feel proud of public education.[23]

Headache Effect - The advantages of certain cooperative arrangements between public and nonpublic schools are overshadowed by the problems which they create for public school personnel.[24]

Inferiority Effect - Some students who transfer into the public schools from nonpublic schools have had an inferior education in the nonpublic schools, and thus create special problems for the public schools.[25]

Inhibition Effect - Knowing they will be criticized by proponents of nonpublic schools, public school leaders tend to be more conservative than they might otherwise be.[26]

Pauper-School Effect - In some areas there is a feeling that public schools are only for those who, for financial or other reasons, cannot gain admission to nonpublic schools. (This effect was postulated twice - once with reference to the elementary level and once to the secondary.)[27]

Pilot-School Effect - Nonpublic schools have developed certain educational programs and techniques which have subsequently been used successfully in the public schools.[28]

Relief Effect - The net effect of the existence of nonpublic schools on the local financing of the public schools is to increase the amount of money per pupil available for public school use.[29]

Superiority Effect - Some students who transfer into the public schools from nonpublic schools have had a superior education in the nonpublic schools, and thus benefit the public schools.[30]

Supplementary Effect - Some public school children benefit significantly from special summer programs provided by nonpulic schools.[31]

Each of the above effects[32] was classified according to the public school operational area on which its influence was presumed to be strongest (community support, financing, program, racial integration, staff, or students) and according to the assumed nature of its influence on public school operation ("bad" or "good"). This classification system, depicted in

Table 1, was intended to facilitate the development of generalizations about

TABLE 1

CLASSIFICATION OF POSTULATED NONPUBLIC SCHOOL EFFECTS ON PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACCORDING TO OPERATIONAL AREA PRIMARILY INFLUENCED AND NATURE OF INFLUENCE

Operational Area Primarily Influenced	Nature of Influence	
	Bad	Good
Community Support	Divisive False-Yardstick	Escape-Valve Foil
Financing	Depressant (Federal) Depressant (State)	Relief
Program	Duplication Inhibition	Competitive Pilot-School
Racial Integration	Color-Separation Escape	Associative
Staff	Coopting Headache	
Students	Dumping Inferiority Pauper-School	Superiority Supplementary

public school administrators' perceptions of nonpublic school effects on public schools.

Hypotheses. On the basis of an underlying conceptualization of major differences between systemic and independent schools, a series of hypotheses relating to expected differences in perceived strengths of the above postulated effects for the two kinds of nonpublic schools was generated. Briefly, this formulation was founded upon 5 very general assumptions: (1) systemic schools tend to be much more numerous than independent schools and (almost by definition) are more highly systematized and bureaucratized than inde-

pendent schools; (2) independent school programs tend to be superior academically to systemic school programs; (3) independent schools tend to be more selective of pupil and staff personnel than do systemic schools; (4) the clientele served by systemic schools tend to be of lower socio-economic status than independent school clientele, and the former tend to patronize nonpublic schools more for religious reasons and less for academic reasons than do the latter; and (5) the financial needs of systemic schools tend to be greater than those of independent schools. Deriving from these broad tendencies, an hypothesis was stated for each effect concerning the expected direction and magnitude of difference in the perceived strength of the effect in terms of the systemic-independent distinction. These hypotheses may be summarized as follows:

1. No significant difference on Associative Effect
2. Independent significantly higher on Color-Separation Effect
3. Independent significantly higher on Competitive Effect
4. Independent significantly higher on Coopting Effect
5. Systemic significantly higher on Depressant Effect (Federal)
6. Systemic significantly higher on Depressant Effect (State)
7. Systemic significantly higher on Divisive Effect
8. Independent significantly higher on Dumping Effect
9. Systemic significantly higher on Duplication Effect
10. No significant difference on Escape Effect
11. Independent significantly higher on Escape-Valve Effect
12. Systemic significantly higher on False-Yardstick Effect
13. Systemic significantly higher on Foil Effect
14. Systemic significantly higher on Headache Effect
15. Systemic significantly higher on Inferiority Effect

16. No significant difference on Inhibition Effect
17. Independent significantly higher on Pauper-School Effect
18. Independent significantly higher on Pilot-School Effect
19. Systemic significantly higher on Relief Effect
20. Independent significantly higher on Superiority Effect
21. Independent significantly higher on Supplementary Effect

The testing of the above hypotheses represented one stage of the study's methodology, outlined below.

Collection and Treatment of Data

The conduct of this research (exclusive of completing the final report) extended over a period of almost one year. During the summer of 1965 the target population of subjects was selected and a brief questionnaire was designed and administered to determine the willingness of some of these subjects to participate in the study and to collect some preliminary data. In the fall of 1965 an opinionnaire was developed and tested, and a sample of prospective participants was drawn. The opinionnaire was administered and the results analyzed statistically during the winter of 1966. That spring a number of interviews were conducted in several cities across the country to check the validity and reliability of the opinionnaire and to gather some additional data. The study's instrumentation, sample, opinionnaire analysis, and interviews are discussed in brief fashion on the next few pages.

Instrumentation. The main instrument utlized in data collection was an opinionnaire, entitled "Relationships between Public and Nonpublic Schools." Its purpose was to determine respondents' perceptions of the

strength with which each of the postulated effects operated in their cities with reference to systemic and independent nonpublic schools, respectively. Structurally, the opinionnaire consisted simply of the statements describing the postulated effects, listed alphabetically according to the effects' names (although, to avoid unnecessarily biasing responses, the names themselves were not included in the instrument). Responses were elicited through a forced choice technique, with response categories based upon a continuum of strength ("No Effect," "Very Weak," "Fairly Weak," "Fairly Strong," and "Very Strong") in relation to each postulated effects perceived impact in a given city. For quantification purposes, the response categories were assigned values from 1 to 5 in the order of listing above. Participants responded to each item twice, in side-by-side fashion, once in terms of the effects on their schools of systemic nonpublic schools and once in relation to those of independent schools.

The initial version of the opinionnaire consisted of 17 postulated effects, each represented by 2 randomly ordered descriptive statements, and was administered to 6 advanced graduate students at The University of Chicago. As a result of this pre-test, 6 new postulated effects were added to the original 17 (2 of these additions resulted merely from splitting both the Dumping Effect and the Pauper-School Effect into elementary and secondary components), and several instructions as well as 6 descriptions were reworded to eliminate lack of clarity; further, it was learned that the mean time for completion was less than 20 minutes, the pairing of items was not obvious to respondents, and the format was viewed by participants as attractive and conducive to easy response. Subsequently, a second version of the opinionnaire, consisting of 2 randomly ordered

items for each of the 23 postulated effects, was constructed and administered to 26 individuals drawn from graduate classes at Chicago and from a group attending a conference on "Religion and Public Education" in Nebraska. Quantified scores on the items of each pair were correlated to provide some indication of the instrument's reliability. This analysis yielded significant mean correlations (at the .05 level of statistical confidence) for all but 1 of the effects; on re-examination, the 2 items representing this effect were recognized as capable of variant interpretations, and were reworded accordingly. The final version of the opinionnaire consisted of 23 statements, each one being the member of the second-version pair which appeared to the investigators to be most clear and concise in wording; these were the statements listed earlier in this chapter. In addition, some information of a biographical and situational nature was requested in the instrument.

Sample. The public school administrators to whom the opinionnaire was administered were limited to those in cities with populations ranging from 100,000 to 200,000 according to the 1960 U.S. census, primarily because the investigators believed that these cities were large enough to contain a considerable number of nonpublic schools and to exhibit many of the problematic characteristics of urbanization, yet small enough that their public school administrators were likely to be aware of nonpublic school effects in the cities and that their superintendents would be accessible to the researchers. A short preliminary questionnaire was mailed to the public school superintendents in these cities to determine whether or not enough of them were willing to participate in the study to justify its conduct. Of the 68 superintendents approached, responses were received from 64 (94.1 per cent), 52 of whom (81.3 per cent) indicated

that they might cooperate. Examination of data on cities from which no responses were received yielded no evidence of systematic bias in this sample.

The main opinionnaire was then mailed to each of these 52 superintendents, along with a request for him to submit a list of the principals in his system. From every list received, 6 names were randomly selected, stratified so that elementary and secondary schools were proportionately represented for each city, and the opinionnaire was mailed to these principals along with a note indicating their superintendents' cooperation in the study. After two follow-up administrations, completed opinionnaires had been received from 41 superintendents (80.4 per cent) and 177 principals (72.0 per cent); 133 of the principals represented elementary schools and 44 represented secondary schools. A total of 218 public school administrators in 41 sizeable cities across the country, then, constituted the sample of participants in this research; these figures represent 69.4 per cent of all individuals whose responses were solicited and 60.3 per cent of all cities in the target population. When respondents were examined in terms of their geographic regions, it appeared that the North Central and West cities were better represented proportionately than were cities in the Northeast and South, possibly because nonpublic schools have been investigated and publicized to a greater extent in the latter than in the former two regions, and possibly because nonpublic schools reputedly operate in manners contrary to public school ideals more in the Northeast (pupil selectivity) and South (racial segregation) than elsewhere in the country.

Opinionnaire Analysis. Responses on the opinionnaire were quantified

and subjected to a variety of statistical treatments to determine significant tendencies in the participants' perceptions of nonpublic schools effects on their schools. Mean scores were computed for each postulated effect, and the hypotheses summarized above were tested by means of Student's t-scores, rank-order correlations between systemic and independent mean scores were also calculated to further explicate relationships between the perceived effects of the 2 types of nonpublic schools. Intercorrelation matrices of systemic and independent effect scores were then constructed; these matrices were factor analyzed by means of principal components analyses and normal varimax rotations were performed to discover whether or not the perceived effects tended to cluster into meaningful factors. When apparently meaningful factors emerged for both systemic and independent effects, factor scores were computed for each respondent and these scores were employed in subsequent analyses.

To discover significant relationships between participants' scores on the various factors and selected personal and situational characteristics, chi-square tests for independence between factor scores and the following 4 independent variables were run: (1) length of public school experience (in years) of the respondent, (2) whether or not he had had experience (as either student or staff member) in a nonpublic school, (3) the geographic region (North Central, Northeast, South, or West) in which his city is located, and (4) the proportion of his city's elementary and secondary pupils enrolled in nonpublic schools. In addition, unequal-Nt-tests were performed on factor scores to discover significant differences between the perceptions of superintendents and principals, and between those of secondary and elementary principals; these computations were supplemented

by the calculation of rank-order correlation coefficients from factor scores for each pair of respondent groups. Finally, a univariate analysis of variance was computed for each factor to determine the relationships between within-city and between-city variances among perceptions and to identify variance which had not been explained by previous analyses. When within-city variance was found to be unexpectedly high in comparison with variance between cities, an index of agreement for each city was computed by intercorrelating respondents within each city on the basis of factor scores and taking the mean of the resultant coefficients. This latter index served to differentiate cities in which agreement among respondents' perceptions was relatively high from those in which agreement was relatively low. The above analyses of factors were conducted for systemic and independent scores separately.

Interviews. The last main phase of this study's methodology was constituted by semistructured, depth interviews with a number of opinionnaire respondents. A national sample of 7 cities was selected for this purpose, chosen primarily on the basis of the indexes of agreement mentioned above. To facilitate this selection the mean of the systemic and independent indexes for each city was taken and "disagreement" cities were defined as those with 5 or more participants in which the mean index was lower than - .050, while "agreement" cities were defined as those with 5 or more respondents in which the index was higher than .250. This procedure yielded 3 "disagreement" cities and 4 "agreement" cities, in which a total of 36 participants (7 central office personnel and 29 principals) were interviewed, for an average of 35 minutes each.

The interviews were conducted to achieve 3 major purposes. First, a sample measure of the opinionnaire's test-retest reliability was obtained

by having each interviewee respond again to 6 randomly selected items, in terms of systemic schools only, and by correlating respondents' retest scores on these items with those on their opinionnaires. Secondly, some limited indication of the instrument's validity as a measure of perception was obtained through probing into the determinants of a participant's responses on the instrument. Finally, the interviews provided a means by which respondents' views on certain important issues concerning public-nonpublic school relationships could be examined in some depth; specifically, information was sought regarding public school administrators' awareness and knowledge of nonpublic schools, contacts between public and nonpublic school administrators, attitudes of public school administrators toward increased federal aid to nonpublic schools, and reasons for relative agreement or disagreement among public school administrators within a given city regarding the effects on their schools of nonpublic schools.

Major Findings

The findings which resulted from treating the data in the ways summarized above were numerous, diverse and, in some instances, quite complex. No attempt is made to report them all here. Rather, only the major findings --those bearing most directly upon the problem under investigation--are presented.[33] In addition, some possible explanations of particular results are considered in this section, while observations and implications of a more general nature are reserved to a later part of the chapter. The analyses of opinionnaire responses are presented first, followed by the results of the interviews.

Analyses of Opinionnaire Responses

As discussed above, the opinionnaire responses were quantified and

subjected to several kinds of statistical analyses. The results of these various treatments are summarized below in the order of their application. Thus, the relative perceived strengths of systemic and independent school effects are reported first, followed by the factor analyses of systemic and independent school effect scores, the relationships between systemic and independent factor scores and selected independent variables, the relationships between systemic and independent factor scores of superintendents and principals, and the within-city variances of systemic and independent factor scores.

Relative Perceived Strengths of Systemic and Independent School Effects. The means of systemic and independent scores on the postulated effects, and significant differences between them, are indicated in Table 2. Three main generalizations emerge from the calculation of mean scores for

TABLE 2

MEANS OF SYSTEMIC AND INDEPENDENT SCORES ON POSTULATED EFFECTS AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THEM

Effect Name	Mean Score		Significant Difference (P=.005)
	Systemic	Independent	
Associative	1.59	1.33	Yes
Color-Separation	1.55	1.33	No
Competitive	1.33	1.33	No
Coopting	1.40	1.32	No
Depressant (Federal)	2.19	1.75	Yes
Depressant (State)	2.11	1.71	Yes
Divisive	1.78	1.60	No
Dumping (Elementary)	1.96	1.74	No
Dumping (Secondary)	2.01	1.72	Yes
Duplication	1.21	1.15	No
Escape	1.77	1.70	No
Escape-Valve	1.52	1.51	No
False-Yardstick	2.04	1.61	Yes
Foil	1.86	1.65	No
Headache	1.67	1.51	No
Inferiority	2.38	2.00	Yes
Inhibition	1.54	1.38	No
Pauper-School (Elementary)	1.32	1.42	No
Pauper-School (Secondary)	1.44	1.49	No
Pilot-School	1.65	1.65	No
Relief	2.63	1.92	Yes
Superiority	1.72	1.78	No
Supplementary	1.40	1.46	No
Total Mean	1.74	1.57	No

both systemic and independent school effects. First, nonpublic school effects on public schools were perceived generally to be very weak. The total mean scores of both systemic and independent school effects fell below the quantified value of the "Very Weak" response category and no individual effect had a mean score which reached the value of the "Fairly Weak" category, in either the systemic or the independent classification. Secondly, the negative effects of nonpublic schools were perceived generally to be stronger than the positive effects. Of the 6 effects ranking among the top (strongest) 7 in both the systemic and independent categories, 5 are among those classified in Table 1 as "bad" in their nature of influence. Third, the nonpublic school effects which influence the financial aspect of public school operation were perceived generally to be stronger than any other category of effects. All of the effects classified in Table 1 as primarily influencing public school finance ranked among the top (strongest) 7 in both the systemic and independent categories. No other operational area placed all of its effects above the median on the ranking scale in either category.

In regard to differences between the perceived effects of systemic schools and those of independent schools, 3 observations seem justified. First, systemic school effects were perceived generally as stronger than independent school effects. The mean score over all effects was higher for systemic than for independent schools and on all 7 of the significant differences at the .005 level which occurred between systemic and independent scores the former were higher. Secondly, the effects on public schools of systemic schools were perceived generally to be more negative than were those of independent schools. With reference to classifications in Table 1, the "bad" effects ranked higher (were viewed as stronger) in the

systemic than in the independent category and, of the 7 effects on which systemic schools scored significantly higher than independent schools at the .005 level, 5 were "bad" while only 2 were "good." Finally, the conceptual formulation on which the hypotheses were based apparently underestimated the importance of the variable, "proportion of students." All but 7 (numbers 5, 6, 10, 12, 15, 16, and 19) of the hypotheses stated earlier were rejected when tested at the .005 level of confidence. None of those which predicted significantly higher independent than systemic scores were supported by the data. Because systemic schools enrolled higher proportions of students than did independent schools in all but 1 of the cities in the sample, it is likely that this variable played a more substantial part in determining perceptions than was recognized in the general formulation underlying the hypotheses.

Factor Analyses of Systemic and Independent School Effect Scores. In utilizing the principal components model to factor analyze the systemic school effect scores, varimax convergence was achieved after 11 rotations and 6 common, independent factors emerged, accounting for 57.5 per cent of the total effect-score variance. The central perceptual tendencies reflected in these factors were determined by examining those effects which loaded at a high or moderate level (.3 or greater) on each factor. The factors were then named and defined operationally as indicated below, where they are presented in decreasing order of factor size with the high-loading (.5 or greater) effects cited in parentheses:

> Valued-Alternative Factor (Associative, Color-Separation, Dumping, and Escape) - The quality of systemic schools is sufficiently high that they attract desirable pupils and staff members, and both programs and personnel in the public schools tend, as a consequence, to be of lower quality than they might be if systemic schools did not exist.
>
> Community-Dissension Factor (Divisive, Inhibition, and Pauper-School) - Systemic schools create cleavages between public and nonpublic school

proponents, with the result that programs in and support for the public schools suffer.

Inferior-Quality Factor (Depressant (Federal), Foil, and Inferiority) - The educational programs provided by systemic schools are inferior, partly for financial reasons, to those provided by the public schools.

Special-Interests Factor (Competitive, Escape-Valve, and Pilot-School) - In catering to clientele who are dissatisfied with the public schools, systemic schools relieve the public schools of some problems and contribute significantly to educational advances, but they also create problems for the public schools in terms of program development.

Mixed-Blessing Factor (Relief) - While substantial systemic school enrollments afford the public schools some financial relief, dysfunctional outcomes also result, particularly in the areas of financial and moral support and pupil personnel.

Pupil-Enrichment Factor (Superiority and Supplementary) - Systemic schools have developed programs which have enriched the education of the public school students who were enrolled in them.

The factor analysis of independent school effect scores, in which 16 rotations were required for varimax convergence, also yielded 6 common factors, accounting for 62.3 per cent of the total effect-score variance. The names and operational definitions given to these factors were as follows:

Mutual-Escape Factor (Color-Separation, Duplication, Escape, and Escape-Valve) -- While the existence of independent schools creates problems for the public schools, it also provides an alternative to the public schools by means of which public schools and dissatisfied patrons may escape from each other.

Prestige-Refusal Factor (Competitive, Coopting, Dumping, Pilot-School, and Superiority--all negative) -- It is not true that independent schools deserve a better reputation than do public schools.

Perceived-Inferiority Factor (Foil, Inferiority, and Relief) -- The programs offered by independent schools are not as good as those provided in the public schools.

Intimidation-Refusal Factor (Headache, Inhibition, and Pauper-School--all negative) -- Independent schools do not, through selectivity, represent a threat to progress in the public schools.

Seasonal-Assistance Factor (Supplementary) -- The supplementary

programs provided by independent schools are of substantial assistance to the public school students who enroll in them.

Burden-Refusal Factor (Depressant (Federal), Depressant (State), Divisive, and False-Yardstick--all negative) -- Independent schools do not represent an obstacle to effective public school operation.

Two general observations pertaining to the above results of the factor analyses are noteworthy. First, the postulated effects tended to cluster according to the nature of their sources in nonpublic schools rather than according to the nature of their influences upon public school operation. As a result, the classification scheme presented in Table 1 was of little value in explicating the factors. The meaningful variable in predicting perceptual cluster would thus appear to be the cause (e.g., pupil selectivity, program quality, and clientele status) rather than the result of nonpublic school effects on public schools. Secondly, while the systemic and independent factors were not identical, there were many similarities between them. This suggests that public school administrators ask basically the same questions about systemic as about independent nonpublic schools.

Relationships between Systemic and Independent Factor Scores and Selected Independent Variables. The possible determinants of perceptions were further illuminated by the investigation of relationships between factor scores and selected personal and situational variables associated with respondents. The outcome of applying chi-square tests for independence is summarized in Table 3. It is immediately apparent that there were not many instances in which factor scores were found to be related at a significant level to the selected independent variables, and that the relationships which did emerge were limited to 3 of the 4 variables considered. The amount of a respondent's experience as a public school admin-

TABLE 3

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SYSTEMIC AND INDEPENDENT FACTOR SCORES AND SELECTED PERSONAL AND SITUATIONAL VARIABLES

Factor Name	Independent Variable							
	Public School Experience		Nonpublic School Experience		Per Cent Nonpublic Enrollment		Geographic Region	
	df.	x^2	df.	x^2	df.	x^2	df.	x^2
Systemic:								
Valued-Alternative	3	5.0	3	0.2	9	21.1[a]	9	16.5
Inferior-Quality	3	3.5	3	5.3	9	4.3	9	9.1
Community-Dissension	3	0.3	3	18.8[a]	9	9.4	9	20.3[a]
Special-Interests	3	2.3	3	3.3	9	9.0	9	9.5
Mixed-Blessing	3	5.3	3	2.8	9	19.4[a]	9	28.8[a]
Pupil-Enrichment	3	3.6	3	7.1	9	11.5	9	3.4
Independent:								
Mutual-Escape	3	3.4	3	1.1	9	4.2	9	9.5
Prestige-Refusal	3	0.6	3	13.2[a]	9	9.1	9	18.6[a]
Perceived-Inferiority	3	2.1	3	0.5	9	11.7	9	25.7[a]
Intimidation-Refusal	3	3.7	3	3.0	9	12.3	9	4.4
Seasonal-Assistance	3	4.9	3	9.4[a]	9	16.3	9	16.3
Burden-Refusal	3	2.1	3	1.9	9	21.4[a]	9	13.8

[a]Significant at .05 level of confidence

istrator in his city was related in no way to his perceptions of nonpublic school effects on public schools. This suggests that public school administrators generally learn little over time about nonpublic schools and, consequently, that many of their perceptions in this regard may reflect personal opinion or attitude rather than knowledge or experience.

Scores on 3 of the systemic factors were significantly related to 1 or more of the remaining 3 independent variables. The view that systemic schools are selective of pupils (as reflected in the Valued-Alternative Factor) was more characteristic of respondents in cities with proportionately high nonpublic school enrollments than of those where nonpublic enrollments are relatively low. The view that systemic schools are divisive (as reflected in the Community-Dissension Factor) was more characteristic of those with no nonpublic

school experience than of those with such experience -- but only for respondents in the North Central region; correspondingly, among those without nonpublic school experience, this view was more characteristic of respondents in the North Central region than elsewhere. The view that systemic schools afford some local financial relief to public schools while at the same time being somewhat selective and divisive (as reflected in the Mixed-Blessing Factor) was more characteristic of respondents in Northeast and North Central cities with proportionately high nonpublic school enrollments than of those in cities with lower nonpublic enrollments located in other regions of the country.

Certain of the personal and situational variables were related at a significant level to scores on 4 of the independent factors. The view that independent schools are unimpressive (as reflected in the Prestige-Refusal Factor) was more characteristic of those who had had experience in nonpublic schools than of those without such experience -- but only for respondents in the North Central region; among those with no nonpublic school experience, this view was more characteristic of respondents in the Northeast region than elsewhere. The view that independent schools are inferior to public schools (as reflected in the Perceived-Inferiority Factor) was more pronounced among those in the Northeast than among others located elsewhere. The view that independent school summer programs are helpful to public school students (as reflected in the Seasonal-Assistance Factor) was more characteristic of respondents with nonpublic school experience than of those who had had no such experience. Finally, the view that independent schools do not represent an obstacle to effective public school operation (as reflected in the Burden-Refusal Factor) was more characteristic of respondents in cities with relatively low nonpublic school enrollments than of those where nonpublic enrollments are comparatively high.

In summary, then, 3 of the selected personal and situational variables were found to be significantly related to scores on certain of the systemic and independent factors. Whether or not a respondent had had experience (as either student or staff member) in a nonpublic school had a bearing, independently of other variables, only on his position regarding the view that independent school summer programs are helpful to public school students (Seasonal-Assistance). When this variable was permitted to interact statistically with geographic region, it was associated with respondents' positions regarding both the view that systemic schools are divisive (Community-Dissension) and the view that independent schools are unimpressive (Prestige-Refusal). The proportion of a city's elementary and secondary pupils enrolled in nonpublic schools was related, independently of other variables, to respondents' positions regarding the views that systemic schools are selective of pupils (Valued-Alternative) and that independent schools do not represent an obstacle to effective public school operation (Burden-Refusal). When the effect of this variable was added statistically to that of geographic region, it was associated with the position of respondents regarding the view that systemic schools afford some local financial relief to public schools while at the same time being somewhat selective and divisive (Mixed-Blessing). The geographic region in which a respondent's city is located had a bearing, independently of other variables, only upon his position regarding the view that independent schools are inferior to public schools (Perceived-Inferiority).

It should be noted that the independent variables considered in the analyses reported above leave unexplained a substantial proportion of factor score variance. Scores on 3 of the systemic factors (accounting for a total of 40.7 per cent of all systemic factor variance) and on 2 of the independent factors (accounting for a total of 35.1 per cent of all independent factor

variance) were significantly related to none of the personal and situational variables utilized in the chi-square tests.

Relationships between Systemic and Independent Factor Scores of Superintendents and Principals. Differences between the mean scores of elementary and secondary principals on the systemic and independent factors, and between the mean factor scores of all principals and those of superintendents, are presented in Table 4. While there were no significant differences between elementary and secondary public school principals' perceptions of nonpublic school effects on public schools, the perceptions of superintendents and principals differed significantly in both the systemic and independent categories.

TABLE 4

MEANS OF PRINCIPALS' AND SUPERINTENDENTS SCORES ON SYSTEMIC AND INDEPENDENT FACTORS AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THEM

Factor Name	Mean Score		Significant Difference[a]	Mean Score		Significant Difference
	Elementary	Secondary		Principals	Superintendents	
Systemic:						
Valued-Alternative	-.020	-.271	No	-.083	.355	Yes
Inferior-Quality	.016	-.121	No	-.018	.081	No
Community-Dissension	.033	-.080	No	.005	-.020	No
Special-Interests	.019	.101	No	.040	-.171	No
Mixed-Blessing	.031	.175	No	.067	-.273	Yes
Pupil-Enrichment	.015	-.053	No	-.002	.010	No
Independent:						
Mutual-Escape	.006	-.023	No	-.002	.036	No
Prestige-Refusal	-.062	.126	No	-.014	.066	No
Perceived-Inferiority	-.094	-.106	No	-.097	.475	Yes
Intimidation-Refusal	.037	.148	No	.066	-.318	Yes
Seasonal-Assistance	.074	.098	No	.080	-.390	Yes
Burden-Refusal	-.015	-.242	No	-.073	.355	Yes

[a] P = .05

In the systemic category, the view that systemic schools are selective of pupils (as reflected in the Valued-Alternative Factor) was more characteristic of superintendents than of principals, and the view that systemic schools afford some local financial relief to public schools while at the same time being somewhat selective and divisive (as reflected in the Mixed-Blessing Factor) was more characteristic of principals than of superintendents. In the independent category, the views that independent schools are inferior to public schools (as reflected in the Perceived-Inferiority Factor) and that independent schools do not represent an obstacle to effective public school operation (as reflected in the Burden-Refusal Factor) were more characteristic of superintendents than of principals, while the views that independent schools do not threaten public school progress through selectivity (as reflected in the Intimidation-Refusal Factor) and that independent school summer programs are helpful to public school students (as reflected in the Seasonal-Assistance Factor) were more characteristic of principals than of superintendents. In both categories the rank orders of factors according to mean scores were virtually opposite for superintendents and principals. This finding suggests that a superintendent's perceptions cannot be considered reliable indicators of those of public school administrators generally in his city.

Within-City Variances of Systemic and Independent Factor Scores. The results of applying one-way analyses of variance to systemic and independent factor scores are presented in Table 5. Variance between cities was significantly greater than variance within cities for scores on 3 of the systemic factors (Valued-Alternative, Community-Dissension, and Mixed-Blessing) and on 3 of the independent factors (Perceived-Inferiority, Indimidation-Refusal, and

TABLE 5

UNIVARIATE ANALYSES OF VARIANCE ON SYSTEMIC AND INDEPENDENT FACTOR SCORES

Factor Name	F-Ratio
Systemic:	
Valued-Alternative	3.7915[a]
Inferior-Quality	1.1392
Community-Dissension	1.5478[a]
Special-Interests	1.2947
Mixed-Blessing	1.6856[a]
Pupil-Enrichment	1.1349
Independent:	
Mutual-Escape	1.0884
Prestige-Refusal	0.6693
Perceived-Inferiority	2.2559[a]
Intimidation-Refusal	1.9935[a]
Seasonal-Assistance	1.2232
Burden-Refusal	1.6577[a]

[a] Significant at the .05 level of confidence

Burden-Refusal). On all but the Intimidation-Refusal Factor, previous (x^2) findings help to explain the significant perceptual variance between cities. However, substantial factor score variance, particularly within cities, is clearly not accounted for by the independent variables considered in this study. Scores on 4 of the 6 factors which did not produce significant F-ratios (Inferior-Quality, Special-Interests, Pupil-Enrichment, and Mutual-Escape) were not related to any of the previously considered variables.

When mean indexes of perceptual agreement among respondents within cities were computed by intercorrelating respondents in each city on the basis of factor scores and taking the mean of the resulting coefficients, they were found to be generally low, ranging from -.337 to .787, with a grand mean of .141. Relationships between this index and the three personal and situational variables which were found previously to have some explanatory

value vis-a-vis perceptual variance were examined by applying the chi-square test for independence at the .05 confidence level. While the index of within-city agreement was not significantly associated with either geographic region or per cent nonpublic school enrollment, it was related positively to the proportion of a city's respondents who had had experience in nonpublic schools. This finding corroborates previous tendencies for familiarity with nonpublic schools to serve as an important determinant of perceptions regarding the effects of those schools on public schools. It also suggests that such familiarity is related to accuracy of perception.

Results of the Interviews

As noted in the preceding section of this chapter, semi-structured, depth interviews were conducted with a total of 36 opinionnaire respondents in 3 "disagreement" cities and 4 "agreement" cities, so designated on the basis of the index of within-city agreement. These interviews were intended primarily to yield data on the reliability and validity of the study's instrumentation and to provide information about participants' views on certain issues associated with public-nonpublic school relationships. Findings pertaining to each of these purposes are summarized below.

Instrumentation. During the interviews participants were asked to respond again (in the systemic category only) to 6 randomly selected opinionnaire items in order to provide a basis for the calculation of test-retest reliability coefficients for the instrument. The results of this endeavor are presented, with some other pertinent data, in Table 6. Although the mean test-retest reliability of the opinionnaire was low, it was statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence, as were the coefficients on 2 of the 6 effects tested. The retest reliabilities were consistently

TABLE 6

RELIABILITY OF INSTRUMENTATION COMPUTED FROM SCORES ON RETEST OF 6 SYSTEMIC EFFECTS

Effect Name	Opinionnaire Mean	Retest Mean	Pre-test Reliability	Retest Reliability
Coopting	1.23	1.83	.571[a]	.089
Depressant (Federal)	2.03	2.40	.595[a]	.273
Divisive	1.76	2.00	.496[a]	.285[a]
Escape	1.54	1.91	.777[a]	.672[a]
Pilot-School	1.82	2.31	.868[a]	.171
Supplementary	1.36	1.83	.868[a]	.218
Mean Reliability			.696[2]	.285[a]

[a] Significant at the .05 level of confidence

lower than coefficients computed from paired item scores during the pre-test of the instrument. Mean scores of respondents on the retest were substantially higher than their original mean scores on the same effects, perhaps in part because of increased familiarity with the effects concerned as a result of participation in this study. Perceptual patterns (as reflected in the rank orders of the 6 effects according to mean scores on the two administrations) did not differ over the three-month period involved, a finding which suggests some evidence of construct validity in the opinionnaire.

There were additional indications that responses on the instrument were valid reflections of interviewees' perceptions of nonpublic school effects on public schools. A number of comments made during the interviews suggested that participants had interpreted the opinionnaire items correctly, that the investigator had interpreted their responses correctly, and that they had exercised care and judgment in recording their own views on the issues in question. Moreover, many of these comments served either to corroborate or

to help explain a number of findings which emerged from the opinionnaire analysis. The validity of recorded perceptions as indicators of actual nonpublic school effects on public schools, however, appeared subject to some doubt. Generally, interviewees' familiarity with nonpublic schools and their effects seemed low. Exceptions to this generalization appeared related to differences among the postulated effects themselves and to role and personality distinctions among the respondents, thus suggesting the importance of considering personal variables in future investigations to a greater extent than was the case in the present study.

Information. The interviews revealed a general lack of concern for, interest in, or first-hand knowledge of nonpublic education on the part of most participants. The typically low familiarity of interviewees with nonpublic schools and their effects apparently resulted from a dearth of communication between public and nonpublic school administrators. Professional contacts between leaders in the two sectors were reportedly infrequent, largely because public school administrators tended to view nonpublic schools as a matter of little concern to public education. Most interviewees saw no need for increased contact either at present or in the future, although a few believed that as the issue of racial integration in the schools grew in intensity improved inter-sector communication would become necessary. A number of respondents viewed "good" public-nonpublic school relationships in their cities as a function of this minimal amount of contact.

An opportunity was also provided during the interviews to explore respondents' positions on the issue of providing federal support for nonpublic education and to investigate possible determinants of perceptual agreement among participants in a given city vis-a-vis nonpublic school effects on

public schools. Interviewees split almost equally on the question of whether or not increased federal aid should be granted to nonpublic schools. Most of those in favor invoked the "child benefit" principle while the majority of those opposed cited the First Amendment. No significant situational determinants of these responses were discovered. Within-city agreement among respondents appeared to be associated with the amount of communication concerning nonpublic schools to which the participants in a city had been exposed in common. In the few instances where some such communication had occurred, it seemed to be related to widespread knowledge and acceptance by principals of the public school superintendents' views, to visibility of and familiarity with the local Catholic church, or to frequent meetings of public school administrators to discuss educational issues in the city, including nonpublic schools.

Conclusions and Speculations

A large amount and variety of data are reflected in the findings reported above. In order to alleviate a possible information overload it is necessary to synthesize these findings and to extract the predominant themes suffusing them as well as some of their more significant implications. The present section is devoted to this task. First, a few conclusions which are directly relevant to the major questions that guided the study are summarized. This is followed by some brief speculations deriving from the study and pertaining to the general problem area of public-nonpublic school communication and cooperation.

Conclusions

As an attempt to gather exploratory information concerning the ways in which the existence of nonpublic schools is perceived by public school admin-

istrators to influence the operation of their schools, this research generated findings relating to 4 main questions that guided its conduct: (1) How are nonpublic schools perceived to affect public schools? (2) What are some of the correlates of variance among these perceptions? (3) Are the perceptions valid reflections of actual nonpublic school effects on public schools? (4) Are the superintendent's perceptions of these effects reliable indicators of the views of public school administrators generally in his city? The findings pertinent to each of these questions are synthesized and conclusions drawn from them in the following paragraphs. The conclusions are neither simple nor final, and their interpretation is subject to the limitations inherent in the study's methodology and sample.

Perceived Effects. The perceptual clusters emerging from the factor analyses suggest that, in considering the effects on public schools of nonpublic schools, public school administrators in medium-sized American cities tend to think in terms of the causes of these effects in nonpublic schools more than in terms of the consequences in public schools. The impact of nonpublic school effects on public schools is perceived generally to be negligible in intensity. Similarities between the systemic and independent factors and the rejection of most of the hypotheses of differential influence indicate little discrimination on the part of public school administrators between the effects of systemic and independent nonpublic schools. It seems likely that, while public school administrators have some fairly consistent and meaningful ideas about what nonpublic schools are and do, they are not generally familiar with nonpublic school effects on their schools.

Correlates of Variance. While variance among public school administrators' perceptions of nonpublic school effects on their schools may be explained in part by personal characteristics (notably, one's experience or

lack thereof in nonpublic schools and one's administrative role in a public school system) and in part by situational characteristics (particularly the proportion of a city's students enrolled in nonpublic schools and the geographic region in which a city is located), a considerable portion of perceptual variance apparently remains unexplained by the independent variables considered in this study. It seems probable that, because of the ways in which the postulated effects clustered, certain operational characteristics of the nonpublic schools themselves may be significant in this regard. Moreover, in light of the relationships which did emerge, it is likely that characteristics associated with respondents' personalities and with regional history and culture may have determined perceptions to a greater extent than this study's methodology was able to measure.

Validity of Perceptions. Public school administrators' perceptions of nonpublic school effects on their schools reflect neither all reality nor all hearsay or attitude: there are elements of each in indeterminate proportions, varying with both respondents and effects. Certain evidences of construct validity suggest that some reality was reflected in the recorded perceptions: the factors which emerged appeared meaningful, particularly in relation to the conceptualization which generated the hypotheses: the majority of chi-square tests yielded relationships which "made sense"; and the rank-order correlation of opinionnaire and retest mean scores indicated that perceptual patterns (although not perceived strengths of effects) changed very little, if at all, over time. On the other hand, some findings render the credibility of perceptions doubtful: the generally low effect scores, coupled with an apparent correlation between their means and standard deviations, suggest that a number of participants responded consistently in the

"No Effect" category, possibly because there was no "Don't Know" category in the opinionnaire; the typically low perceptual agreement within cities and the lack of relationship between perceptions and length of public school administrative experience (indicating that the "old hand" knows no more about nonpublic school effects than does the "neophyte") raise questions about the knowledge base underlying responses; and the interview data make it clear that the vast majority of participants possessed little first-hand familiarity with nonpublic schools. Thus, the available evidence leads one to conclude that the recorded perceptions reflects a mixture of knowledge, hearsay, and attitude. This conclusion tends to invalidate one of the assumptions basic to the study -- that the actual influences of nonpublic schools upon public schools are determined to a large extent by public school administrators' perceptions of these effects.

Superintendent's Reliability. The public school superintendent's perceptions of nonpublic school effects on his schools may not generally be accepted as reliable indicators of the perceptions of all public school administrators within his city. Over the sample as a whole, the perceptions of central office personnel tended to differ substantially from those of building-level administrators. In addition, it was generally true that perceptual agreement within cities was low. The superintendent, thus, cannot be relied upon to accurately "speak for" his subordinates insofar as perceived effects of nonpublic schools on public schools are concerned.

Speculations

Numerous implications for future research on public-nonpublic school relations inhere in the study reported in this chapter. These include not only the recognition of problems associated with its design and methodology

but also the identification of potentially fruitful directions which future investigations in this area might take. It is not the intent here, however, to explore these implications for further study and research; they have been discussed in some detail elsewhere.[34] Rather, in concluding this chapter attention is limited to a brief consideration of the implications for practice and policy of the conclusions deriving from the study.

At the beginning of the chapter some apparent obstacles to functional working relationships between public and nonpublic schools were indicated. It was observed that, while most of these obstacles appeared at first blush to be respectably objective and rational in nature, there actually seemed to be a strong emotional element running through them -- that the obstacles were, in some measure, rationalizations of such feelings as defensiveness, protectiveness, suspicion, and fear vis-a-vis the effects of the existence of schools in one sector upon the operation of schools in the other sector. This observation generated the expectation that effective communication and cooperation between public and nonpublic school officials would be advanced in instances where those in once sector perceived the operation of their schools to be enhanced by the existence of schools in the other sector, and retarded in instances where those in one sector perceived the operation of their schools to be threatened by the existence of schools in the other sector. The report of an examination of public school administrators' perceptions of nonpublic school effects on public schools has been presented within this context.

The results of the study, however, provide insufficient evidence to support the above expectation. While the overall effects of nonpublic schools on public schools were perceived to be somewhat more negative than positive, this tendency is outweighed by the clearly negligible perceived

impact of nonpublic school effects on public schools. Moreover, the nonpublic school effects were apparently perceived less in terms of their influence on public school operation than in terms of assumed characteristics of nonpublic schools. It cannot be concluded on the basis of this study's data, then, that public school administrators view their efforts as being either threatened or enhanced by the existence of nonpublic schools. Thus, if personalized obstacles to fruitful intersector relationships exist, they cannot be accounted for by a perceived negative impact of nonpublic schools upon public schools.[35]

What, then, does account for the apparent obstacles to cooperation and communication between public and nonpublic schools? While no definitive answer to this question may be found in the study's data, a strong clue is implicit in the finding that public school administrators seem generally to be unfamiliar with nonpublic schools: respondents apparently neither knew much nor cared much about the other sector. Some ramifications of such a condition have been explored, with reference to another context, by Bridges:

> Not knowing a person and not having a prior history of interaction with an individual or group can contribute to the withholding of trust. A lack of familiarity often produces uncertainty. What is unpredictable is the nature of the person's purposes and motives and how he will behave in the situation. Under such conditions one can never be sure whether the person should be trusted.[36]

According to this argument, it is possible that emotionally-based obstacles to functional working relations between public and nonpublic schools are the result, at least in part, simply of a lack of familiarity with one sector on the part of those in the other.

The data of this study suggest some degree of unfamiliarity with nonpublic schools on the part of public school administrators and a general

lack of contact between the two sectors. If this unfamiliarity contributes to the erection of emotionally-based obstacles to effective inter-sector relationships, and if such relationships are deemed desirable for both public and nonpublic education, then the conclusions of this study imply that ways must be found to familiarize administrators in one sector with schools in the other (or at least to familiarize public school officials with nonpublic schools[37]). This implication suggests a need for the design of continuing education experiences which will bring public and nonpublic school administrators together to explore common interests, basic differences, and mutual problems. While some inter-sector contact has been stimulated by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, evidence reported previously suggests that such contact, at least during the first year of the Act's implementation, tended to be infrequent and superficial.[38] It is apparent that something more substantial than mere legislative proclamation is required to promote effective communication and cooperation between public and nonpublic schools.

It must not, however, be presumed that educational leaders are unaware of the need for increased and improved contact between public and nonpublic schools; nor are they entirely unresponsive to this need. A growing concern with the role of nonpublic education in urban centers has been expressed by personnel associated with both systemic and independent schools.[39] This concern often reflects an interest in advancing inter-sector communication and cooperation. Erickson, for example, has noted a growing responsiveness to public school problems on the part of nonpublic school personnel.[40] Donohue has called for public-parochial school cooperation in educational parks and supplementary centers, and for the offering of available Catholic classrooms and staff to public schools to relieve crowding and to provide special programs.[41] And McManus has suggested that big-city public school

boards "contract with Catholic and other private schools to provide an exceptional kind of education for economically disadvantaged children in the inner city."[42] With reference to independent schools, Howe has spoken to the need for more "entangling alliances" between these schools and related societal institutions, including the public schools,[43] and Potter has responded to this challenge from the perspective of the National Association of Independent Schools.[44]

In regard to ongoing cooperative endeavors between public and nonpublic schools, several examples are reported in the literature. A recent NAIS publication by Yeomans documents a number of instances of collaboration between independent schools and local public and parochial schools.[45] Concerning systemic schools, a group of advanced graduate students at The Ohio State University, in examining public-parochial school cooperation in a major Ohio city, found numerous areas of cooperative effort and classified them as (1) voluntary cooperation, which is purely local in nature and exists chiefly at the administrative level; (2) cooperation resulting from federal incentives under NDEA, ESEA, AND EPDA; or (3) "mandated" cooperation under state legislation. They concluded from this investigation that such cooperative activities between public and nonpublic schools in that city have resulted in mutual understanding and support, increased harmony in operation, and optimal use of the resources available to each sector.[46] A few illustrations of the second type of cooperation noted above, drawn from a nationwide sample, are presented in the second annual report of FSEA Title I.[47] And in the April, 1969, issue of School Management, much of which is devoted to the topic of relationships between public and nonpublic (specifically, Catholic) schools, several examples of informal communication and cooperation between the two sectors are described.[48]

It must be noted, however, that in the vast majority of communities surveyed by School Management little evidence of formal, regular cooperative ventures between public and nonpublic school officials was found.[49] A similar observation emerges from a study recently completed by Konkel, who interviewed a number of public and nonpublic school administrators in a mid-west urban area to explore working relationships between the two educational sectors. His data suggest that, while officials of public and nonpublic schools say they desire improved communication and cooperation with each other and increased formalization by written policy or regulation of such relationships, progress in these directions is very limited. On the basis of these data, he concludes with a discouraging, but significant, suggestion:

> One wonders whether a self-fulfilling prophecy is operative among the administrators in this study. That is, among public school officials there may be an atmosphere of bureaucracy, and among nonpublic school officials there may be an atmosphere of the minority. Bureaucrats have a way of becoming mired in the organizational maze, and the minority has a way of becoming tired in their climbing.[50]

Also demoralizing is the fact that, despite previously noted shortcomings in the involvement of nonpublic schools in ESEA Title I programs during its first year of operation, nonpublic school children's participation in these programs actually declined during the second (most recently reported) year.[51]

Thus, while acknowledging some encouraging indications to the contrary, one is not overwhelmed by evidence that the indifferent separatism between public and nonpublic schools, substantiated by the study reported in this chapter, is currently undergoing any significant nationwide alteration.

Summary

The critical condition of education in today's urban areas, and certain unique characteristics of nonpublic schools located mainly in these cities, suggest the desirability of functional working relationships between public and nonpublic schools. But historically, public-nonpublic school relations have been uneasy and there is only limited evidence of fruitful communication and cooperation between the two sectors at present. A number of possible barriers to inter-sector collaboration may be identified, but it is apparent that a strong element of emotion runs through most of them. In an attempt to shed light on some of this resistance to mutuality, the study reported in this chapter investigated the perceptions held by public school administrators concerning the effects of nonpublic schools upon the operation of public schools. A thorough review of the relevant literature resulted in the postulation of 23 nonpublic school effects on public schools. Operational descriptions of these effects were incorporated into an opinionnaire, which was completed and returned by several randomly selected principals and the superintendent of public schools in each of 41 American cities with populations between 100,000 and 200,000. Respondents indicated the strength with which they perceived each effect to operate in their cities with reference, first, to systemic nonpublic schools (members of national, religiously supported systems) and, secondly, to independent nonpublic schools (not identified with any formal system). Responses were analyzed statistically to determine the nature of perceived nonpublic school effects on public schools (both in general and in terms of the systemic-independent distinction), and to examine some characteristics of variance among these perceptions. Interviews were then conducted with a sample of participants in 7 cities to explore some implications of opinionnaire responses and to establish the instrument's reliability and validity.

The chief findings resulting from the opinionnaire analysis were as follows: (1) respondents perceived the negative effects of nonpublic schools to be slightly stronger than their positive effects, and their effects on public school finance to be slightly stronger than those on other operational areas, but in general they perceived the effects of nonpublic schools on public schools to be negligible in impact; (2) respondents perceived few differences in strength between systemic and independent schools and, wherever differences did occur, the effects of systemic schools were viewed as stronger; (3) respondents' perceptions tended to cluster in accordance more with the nature of the effects' sources in nonpublic schools than with the nature of their influences on public school operation; (4) while respondents' perceptions were related in a few instances to whether or not they had had experience in nonpublic schools, to the proportion of their cities' students enrolled in nonpublic schools, and to the geographic region in which they were located, perceptions were unrelated to the amount of experience respondents had had as public school administrators; (5) although distinctions between elementary and secondary principals' perceptions were negligible, perceptions of superintendents and principals differed significantly; and (6) perceptual agreement among a city's respondents was generally low and was positively related to the proportion of respondents with experience in nonpublic schools. The major result of the interviews was the finding that participants in general lacked concern for, interest in, and familiarity with nonpublic schools or their effects on public schools. On the basis of the above findings it was concluded that the credibility of public school administrators' perceptions as indicators of actual nonpublic school effects on public schools is limited, that the perceptions of the superintendent cannot be accepted as reliable indicators of the perceptions of public school administrators generally in his city, and that substantial perceptual variance

remains unexplained by the independent variables considered in this study. Implicit in the results of the research reported here is the likelihood that the chief obstacle to effective working relations between public and nonpublic schools is a simple lack of contact between educational administrators in the two sectors. Despite scattered evidence of inter-sector collaboration, it seems clear that increased efforts to promote contact must be launched if the indifferent separatism currently apparent across the country is to be replaced by fruitful mutuality between leaders of public and nonpublic schools.

Notes

1 Ellwood P. Cubberley, Public Education in the United States: A Study and Interpretation of American Educational History (Chicago: Houghton Mifflin, 1934). p. 164.

2 See, for example: Pierce v. Society of Sisters, 268 U.S. 510 (1925).

3 See, for example: Leonard V. Koos, Private and Public Secondary Education: A Comparative Study (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1931); Kenneth F. Schrepfer, "A Comparison of College Academic Achievement of Public School and Private School Graduates during the Freshman Year in the College of the University of Pennsylvania" (unpublished Master's thesis, Dept. of Education, University of Pennsylvania, 1955); David Iwamoto, "Don't Sneer at Public Education," NEA Journal, XLVII (1958), pp. 118-19; and Merle W. Tate and Jean S. Straub, "Thinking Abilities of Ninth-Grade Students from Catholic and Public Elementary Schools," School Review, LXXII (Spring, 1964), pp. 74-88.

4 For examples of reactions to aid for nonpublic education provided in the National Defense Education Act, see: Agnes E. Meyer, Slums and Schools, Dr. Conant's New Report," The Atlantic (February, 1962), p. 79; Daniel U. Levine, "Federal Aid for Nonpublic Education: Design for Decimating Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIII (June, 1962), pp. 388-9; and George R. LaNoue, "Religious Schools and Secular Subjects," Harvard Educational Review, XXXII (Summer, 1962), pp. 255-91.

For examples of reactions to aid for nonpublic education provided in Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, see: (Stanley M. Elam), "Johnsonian Compromise Could Wreck Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVI (February, 1965), p. 249; Leo Pfeffer, quoted in "Delight, Doubt -- or Dilemma?" School Boards, VIII (February, 1965), p. 9; and (Stanley M. Elam), "Did We Break an Arm Sliding Home?" Phi Delta Kappan, XLVI (May, 1965), p. 425.

5 "Statistic of the Month: Nonpublic Schools in the 50 Largest Cities," School Life, Vol. 46, No. 8 (July, 1964), p. 14.

6 Donald A. Erickson and Andrew M. Greeley, "Non-Public Schools and Metropolitanism," Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, ed. Robert J. Havighurst (Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1968 Yearbook), pp. 288-9.

7 See, for example: National Education Association, Shared-Time Programs: An Exploratory Study (Research Report 1964-R 10, Washington: The Association, 1964), p. 10; National Education Association, What Teachers Think: A Summary of Teacher Opinion Poll Findings, 1960-1965 (Research Report 1965-R 13; Washington: The Association, 1965), p. 37; and Mary Perkins Ryan, Are Parochial Schools the Answer? (Chicago: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963), pp. 159-60.

8 Vincent C. Nuccio and John J. Walsh, A National Level Evaluation Study of the Impact of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 on the Participation of Non-Public School Children (Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts: Boston College, 1967).

9 Erickson and Greeley, op. cit., p. 307.

10 Nuccio and Walsh, op. cit., p. 260.

11 Robert J. Havighurst, "Metropolitan Development and the Educational System," School Review, LXIX (Autumn, 1961), p. 258.

12 Philip Pitruzello, "Admission Policies of Selected Catholic Schools and the Characteristics of the Students and Parents" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Education, University of Chicago, 1962).

13 Koos, op. cit.

14 Neil G. McCluskey, Catholic Viewpoint on Education (Garden City: Hanover House, 1959), p. 104.

15 Frank J. Munger and Richard F. Fenno, National Politics and Federal Aid to Education (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1962).

16 Theodore Powell, The School Bus Law (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1960).

17 Richard Carter, Voters and Their Schools (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1960), p. 56.

18 Peter H. Rossi and Andrew M. Greeley, "The Impact of the Roman Catholic Denominational Schools," School Review, LXXII (Spring, 1964), p. 41.

19 National Education Association, Shared-Time Programs: An Exploratory Study, loc. cit.

20 Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in Black and White (New York: Random House, 1964), p. 291.

21 James Bryant Conant, Slums and Suburbs (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961), p. 101.

22 Joseph F. Maloney, "The Lonesome Train" in Levittown (University, Ala.: University of Alabama Press, 1958), p. 13.

23 Tate and Straub, op. cit., p. 74.

24 National Education Association, loc. cit.

25 Tate and Straub, loc. cit.

26 Myron Lieberman, The Future of Public Education (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960), p. 58.

27 James Stewart Davie, "Education and Social Stratification" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1951).

28 Roald F. Campbell, Luvern L. Cunningham, and Roderick F. McPhee, The Organization and Control of American Schools (Columbus: Merrill, 1965), p. 495.

29 Jerry Miner, Social and Economic Factors in Spending for Public Education (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1963), p. 103.

30 Koos, op. cit.

31 Donald A. Erickson, "Impending Realignments between Public and Nonpublic Schools" (unpublished paper presented at annual convention of National School Boards Association, Boston, April 6, 1965), pp. 4-8.

32 It has become clear since the study was completed that this list of postulated effects is not exhaustive. It is, however, comprehensively illustrative.

33 A more comprehensive report of the study's findings is provided in Robin H. Farquhar, "Public School Administrators' Perceptions of Nonpublic School Effects on Public Schools" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Dept. of Education, University of Chicago, 1967), pp. 164-329.

34 Ibid. and Robin H. Farquhar, "The Public School Administrator Views the Catholic School -- Or Does He?" Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 4, No. 3 (Fall, 1968), p. 13.

35 This does not, incidentally, deny that nonpublic school effects on public schools are in reality negative -- or positive -- for some discrepancies between perceptions and reality are indicated in the data. It simply denies that nonpublic school effects on public schools were perceived to be negative to a significant extent by public school administrators.

36 Edwin M. Bridges, "Subjective and Objective Aspects of Demands for Imvolvement," Administrator's Notebook, Vol. XVII, No. 6 (February, 1969), p. 3.

37 There is no evidence in this study's findings that nonpublic school administrators are unfamiliar with public schools, and one suspects that this is not typically the case.

38 Nuccio and Walsh, op. cit.

39 See, for example: Thomas M. Gannon, "Parochial Education and the Inner City," Urban Review (June, 1967), pp. 18-20; Russell Shaw, ed., "Education and the Urban Crisis," United States Catholic Conference Task Force on Urban Problems, Vol. I, No. 4 (April, 1969), pp. 1-7; and several recent publications of the National Association of Independent Schools.

40 Erickson, op. cit.

41 James C. Donohue, "Catholic Education in Contemporary Society," Report of the 64th NCEA Annual Meeting, National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin (August, 1967).

42 William E. McManus, quoted in "General Session Discussions," Catholic Education Today and Tommorrow, Eds. Michael P. Sheridan and Russell Shaw (Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association, 1968), pp. 88-9.

43 Harold Howe, II, "The Need for Entangling Alliances," The Independent School Bulletin (May, 1967).

44 Cary Potter, Independence and Cooperation (Boston: National Association of Independent Schools, 1967).

45 Edward Yeomans, The Changing Role of the Independent School (Boston: National Association of Independent Schools, April, 1969).

46 Members of the 1968-1969 Practicum in Educational Administration, Metropolitan School District Cooperation (Columbus: Center for Educational Administration, The Ohio State University, 1969), pp. 120-8.

47 Title I/Year II (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968), pp. 54-5.

48 "Catholic Schools," School Management (April, 1969), pp. 44-55 and 78-90, passim.

49 Ibid., p. 78.

50 Richard H. Konkel, "Administrative Relationships between Public and Nonpublic Schools in a Mid-West Urban Area" (unpublished internship study, College of Education, Bowling Green State University, June, 1969), p. 79.

51 Title I/Year II, op. cit., p. 5.